

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 4-14 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of August 31, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1 and 12 are amended, and claims 13 and 14 are cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 12 can be found at least from page 7, lines 7-14. In addition, the limitations from claims 13 and 14 are incorporated into claim 12.

This response is submitted after the filing of a Notice of Appeal, which was filed on December 3, 2007, and with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

**Claim Rejections Under § 103**

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Grohoski (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0225885) in view of Aaro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,020). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in amended claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite that the configuration register is configured to receive mode setting instructions from a protected application. Applicant respectfully submits that at least this limitation of amended claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that Grohoski fails to disclose a configuration register arranged to indicate to the accelerator whether secure mode or normal mode is set by the processor arranged in the device, and relies upon Aaro for this teaching. However, Aaro fails to disclose or suggest that the configuration register is configured to receive mode setting instructions from a protected application, as recited in amended claim 1. Instead, Aaro only discloses that the mode selector (7) may take the form of a mode switch (8), which may be a manual switch such as a button on the casing of the mobile phone. See Aaro column 3, lines 6-9. While Aaro also discloses that the mode switch (8) may be implemented using software, Aaro does not disclose or suggest that this software is a protected application, but instead states that the user may select the mode using the keypad (3) and display (4). See Aaro

column 3, lines 9-11. Therefore, the configuration register does not receive mode setting instructions from a protected application, but rather either a manual switch or software operable by the user. Therefore, the user can set the mode of operation without the use of protected applications. In contrast to claim 1, only protected applications are allowed to set the configuration register. Therefore, for at least this reason claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claim 12 is amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and contains limitations similar to claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claim 12 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The dependent claims depending from the above mentioned independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 13, on page 6 of the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Grohoski in view of Aaro, and in further view of Srinivasan et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0158742). Claim 10 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, and Srinivasan fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of the other cited references identified above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 10 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

**Conclusion**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fee deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23-0442.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 27 February 2008

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 004955



Keith R. Obert  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 58,051